MDM Declaration Exhibit A-05

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

SUSANNA MIRKIN, * Case No. 18-CV-02949 (ARR)

individually and on behalf of others similarly situated,

*

Plaintiffs, * Brooklyn, New York * August 27, 2020

XOOM ENERGY, LLC, et al,

Defendants.

TRANSCRIPT OF CIVIL CAUSE FOR VIDEO MOTION HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE RAMON E. REYES, JR. UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

V.

For the Plaintiff: STEVEN L. WITTELS, ESQ.

J. BURKETT MCINTURFF, III, ESQ.

STEVEN D. COHEN, ESQ.

Wittels McInturff Palikovic

18 Half Mile Road Armonk, NY 10504

For the Defendants: DANIEL J. BROWN, ESQ.

CHRISTOPHER A. ROJAO, ESQ. McCarter & English, LLP

100 Mulberry Street Newark, NJ 07102

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

Fiore Reporting and Transcription Service, Inc. 4 Research Drive, Suite 402 Shelton, Connecticut 06484 (203)929-9992

2

names to receive services, so we're not sure if there is billing data relating to Boris, that Boris paid anything, or if it's in somebody else's name. So if plaintiffs want to provide that information to us as to -- if he signed up in his own name or someone else's name and who paid, we'd be happy to look for that.

Regarding amending the complaint, Your Honor, we would submit that the plaintiffs would need leave to file an amended complaint. And we would request a briefing on that issue because we don't believe the plaintiffs were aware of their claims previously at the time that they — if they did receive natural gas services, they would have been aware of that. And they didn't allege that claim in this lawsuit.

So I think we would request briefing on whether or not plaintiffs would be entitled to relation back based on the allegations in the complaint, whether or not they're fictitious entities, all of that we would request briefing on. But we wouldn't submit that it would be appropriate at this time to simply permit an amended pleading with relation back without legal briefing on that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, certainly XOOM had notice of the gas claim, whether it's adequately pled or not. So I don't know how they would be prejudiced were I to grant an amended pleading and allow it to relate back to the original filing. And all that does is just extend the statute of limitations

```
10
 1
        period, right? They could file tomorrow a new case on gas and
 2
        you would have a shorter statute of limitations period, right?
 3
                  MR. ROJAO: Well, Your Honor, they would need a
        plaintiff who was a natural gas customer. And they would need
 4
        a plaintiff who was a natural gas customer within the
 5
        limitations period tomorrow, and we submit that Boris would
 6
        not be that plaintiff.
 7
                  THE COURT: Mr. Cohen, does Boris have a gas
 8
        contract with XOOM? Do you know?
 9
                  MR. COHEN: We have the contract that defendants
10
11
        produced and on there is the account number. So regarding
12
        defense counsel's statement that they might not know how to
13
        find it because it might be in someone else's name, they
14
        should be able to pull it up based on the document they
15
        produced that has the account number and the address. So I
16
        don't see why that would be any difficulty on their end.
                  THE COURT: So it has an account number and address,
17
18
        and it has two names or one name?
19
                  MR. COHEN: The documents that we received, the
20
        enrollment and the contract, I believe just has Boris' name.
21
        It has his email address. It has his phone number.
22
                  THE COURT: Same email address and phone number that
23
        he used for the electric?
24
                  MR. COHEN: I believe it might be different, but I'd
25
        have to double-check.
```

XOOM, identify someone who is damaged and assert claims on behalf of that party. Without that, there is no Article 3 standing in this case.

THE COURT: This isn't a motion to dismiss for lack of standing.

MR. ROJAO: I understand that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: This is a motion to compel discovery.

And I thought there was a gas contract with Mr.

Mirkin.

MR. ROJAO: So, again, Mr. Mirkin apparently may have enrolled to receive natural gas services, but as part of this complaint, they haven't alleged that Mr. Mirkin was a natural gas customer, that he paid anything to XOOM, or that he was damaged in any way by XOOM with respect to that natural gas contract. That contract simply came up in terms of reviewing things related to the Mirkins, but there's nothing about that in the complaint.

THE COURT: If it's not -- if it's not relevant, why did you produce it?

MR. ROJAO: It's relevant to show plaintiffs' prior communications with XOOM and it's relevant to determine whether or not --

THE COURT: Prior communications about what, about electric, no, about gas?

MR. ROJAO: About signing up for -- how he signed up

```
1
        for services, whether or not that was even him, Your Honor.
                  So we would submit that plaintiffs need to --
 2
 3
                  THE COURT: How he signed up for what services, gas
        services? How is that relevant to his electric?
 4
                  MR. ROJAO: Well, we don't know if that was him and
 5
        that's the thing. Again, he signs up --
 6
 7
                  THE COURT: You don't have any records on -- you
 8
        don't have any records on whether he paid for gas?
                  MR. ROJAO: We have to review that, Your Honor, and
 9
10
        that's the thing. Because the records for Susanna --
11
                  THE COURT: Motion to compel granted with respect to
12
        gas only.
13
                  Now, let's move to the customer complaints.
14
                  The complaint has gas all over it. I think the
15
        plaintiffs did drop the ball in not specifically breaking out
16
        their breach of contract claim, gas or electric, or having a
        separate breach of contract claim for gas, but in the lead up
17
18
        to that section, gas is all over the place. It's fair game.
19
        Putting aside whether there's standing, we're not there yet,
20
        it's relevant. The discovery request, it is relevant.
21
                  Federal rules are notice pleading and the I think
22
        the defendants had plenty of notice that gas was in play.
23
                  Why do you need these customer complaints, Mr.
24
        Cohen?
25
                  MR. COHEN: It's more than just the customer
```

know if that was one where there were multiple cases filed such that interim class counsel did make sense under that circumstance.

I just don't -- they may not have done it in that case and that may be their normal practice. I don't know.

But my point is there's the -- specter's the wrong word to use -- there's the veneer, there's the gloss that this is -- that it should be more than it is. That's really our position with respect to the bootstrapping. Perhaps bootstrapping is too strong a word, but that's the concern there.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. I will take it under advisement and you'll know shortly.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. WITTELS: Your Honor, the only point is while we may not have mentioned it, I thought we did, but if we didn't, there was only one class action that was filed after ours in New Jersey in federal court after we had already been litigating it here in New York. So it wasn't multiple class actions. It was the same scenario. And Judge Levy felt that the time had come where we should be appointed and it was to protect the class's interested, which we did.

THE COURT: The rule itself doesn't require multiple class --

MR. WITTELS: No.

THE COURT: -- actions or even a second class action